DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 619 HE 029 248

AUTHOR Hamilton, Karen S.
TITLE Acceptance of New and Junior Faculty into Four-Year Institutions of Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography.
PUB DATE [96]
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Career Development; *College Faculty; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Individual Development; Nontenured Faculty; Quality of Working Life; Stress Variables

ABSTRACT

This annotated bibliography offers summaries and evaluations of 23 research reports originally published from 1968 through 1995 concerning the status, acceptance, and professional development of new and junior faculty at institutions of higher education. Studies report on the sources of stress faced by new faculty, sources of aid, and programs which have been shown to improve professional and personal well-being of new and junior faculty. Overall analysis finds that new faculty members experience significant job-related stress; they often suffer from low self-esteem about their teaching and writing, and experience loneliness and limited collegial support. Institutional commitments and support from the top down are encouraged to help new faculty adjust and be successful. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 396 619

ACCEPTANCE OF NEW AND JUNIOR FACULTY INTO FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Karen S. Hamilton
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE029248

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen S. Hamilton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

INTRODUCTION

Many new faculty members were hired during the 1960's and 70's at institutions across the country. Today many of those same faculty are now retiring, and the numbers of new faculty needed are increasing as old positions need to be filled. At the same time, colleges and universities continue to look only for the best as they are called upon to meet state mandates and accreditation standards plus improve declining enrollments.

The purpose of this annotated bibliography is to present research on the acceptance of new and junior faculty into institutions of higher learning. This work identifies the status of new and junior faculty. It identifies their places in the ranks of teaching and researching faculties, identifying the sources of stress they face in obtaining tenure and in determining what is expected of them. It identifies sources of aid in helping them develop both professionally and personally as they find their niche in academia.

In addition, this bibliography addresses issues which have been shown to improve the status of new and junior faculty. A number of programs which are different from the traditional faculty development approaches are presented. Studies regarding training might take place in graduate school, mentoring, improving relationships with fellow faculty, and other faculty development programs are also presented.

What appears to be a common metaphor throughout much of this research is that new faculty are "thrown to the wolves" with little consideration that the completion of a Ph.D. does not necessarily assure that they have the necessary confidence and skills in the classroom to be effective instructors. Another common metaphor echoed by new and junior faculty is that they are expected to "hit the ground running."

New faculty assume they are trained and ready for what is expected of them in higher education positions. Heavy teaching demands and becoming familiar with the institution often overwhelm them. Senior faculty often do not see as their responsibility to oversee new or junior faculty. They appear to be hesitant to accept new faculty into the academia fold. Senior faculty themselves do not often welcome criticism nor care to give even the smallest amount of help or constructive criticism. What is expected may quickly become disillusionment when reality emerges.

The studies in this bibliography clearly indicate that new faculty experience significant job-related stress. They often suffer from low self-esteem about their teaching and writing, loneliness, and limited collegial support. The studies here also indicate that there are solutions to bringing expectations closer in line with reality. Finally, institutional commitments and support from the top down probably go a long way toward helping new faculty adjust and be successful.

The Importance of Teaching. A memorandum to the new college teacher. (1968). Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Teaching, C. Easton Rothwell, Chair.

The earliest document to be researched for this bibliography was this report written out of a concern for the improvement of college teaching. Based in a society which at the time was supposedly giving too little priority to the quality of university teaching, this report addresses many of the same issues which are being addressed today as later bibliographies will show--specifically, the dilemma for the new Ph.D. of how to teach undergraduates and at the same time get on with one's own scholarship and be recognized for doing both well.

This report exemplifies the kind of thinking which prevailed in the 60's and still prevails at most institutions today. The new or junior faculty member must learn to help himself adjust to the rigors of higher education. The university places full responsibility upon the new teacher to adjust, learn techniques of teaching never used as a graduate assistant, and learn the implied procedures for obtaining tenure.

The report never mentions the possibility that the new or junior faculty member should seek help from any senior faculty member, or a department chair, or any faculty development programs. Instead, it is a "how to manual" or crash course in effective course planning and lecturing, using proper teaching aids, showing expertise in front of students, doing self evaluation to find out what is effective or ineffective, and above all keeping up with one's research. The instructor must do all of these proportionately so that teaching efficacy does not suffer.

All are well intended ideas and suggestions--but this report stops short of reality. The university does have an investment in the new faculty member and shares the responsibility in helping him/her to meet success. Fortunately, since this report, researchers have gone below the surface and have been able to identify other underlying causes and cures for the new and junior faculty member in solving his dilemma. The words "mentoring" and "reducing stress," and "faculty development" are now defined and recognized.

Finkelstein, M., & LaCelle-Peterson, M. (1992). New and junior faculty: A review of the literature. In M. Sorcinelli and A. Austin (Eds.), Developing New and Junior Faculty (pp. 5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Defining new and junior faculty can pose a problem in identifying literature on this topic and gathering research data. Unlike other research which can control the selection of a sample from a defined population, researchers are faced with a wide range of definitions across various data sources. The authors use the definitions developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989).

"Junior faculty," the more inclusive group under the "new faculty" subgroup, are defined by age, rank, and tenure status (or lack of). "New faculty" are defined as those who have recently completed the Ph.D. or terminal professional degree and are embarking on a lifetime career in academe. Most research is institution-based and includes a broad range of faculty across disciplines who are new to a particular institution. This definition could include persons making career changes and faculty with experience from other institutions. Usually the terms are used somewhat loosely to refer to groups of non-tenured full-time faculty below the associate professor rank.

Finkelstein and LaCelle-Peterson's extensive review illuminates several issues--many of which are presented in other works in this annotated bibliography. First, new and junior faculty find themselves in non-tenure track positions. Specifically, nearly 50 percent of the appointments fall into this category. Most of these positions are held by men rather than women, probably because women typically are employed by fewer institutions for longer periods.

Second, those faculty who secure tenure-track or probationary appointments are faced with numerous pressures, including pressure to publish quality research in order to be tenured within the appropriate time (usually six years). In the meantime, they are working at least 48 hours per week in their institutional responsibilities. This commitment is comparable to their senior colleagues who are tenured. These many hours per week can adversely affect leisure time and family life.

It is not surprising to find research such as this which indicates that junior faculty are less satisfied overall than senior faculty. However, it is disheartening that the researchers presume this to be simply the precise nature of the junior faculty's work experience--it goes with the territory so to speak. Research shows in many of the following entries here that the dissatisfaction is due to growing disappointment which new and junior faculty develop regarding their perceived place within the institutional hierarchy.

Seldin, P. (1990). Academic environments and teaching effectiveness. In P. Seldin (Ed.), How Administrators Can Improve Teaching (pp. 3-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This book includes a broad selection of articles dealing with effecting change in university teaching. As the editor, Seldin begins the selections by establishing that there is an urgent need for institutions to identify their roles in improving teaching quality. He points to reasons why this need exists.

First, a primary goal of an institution is its production and diffusion of new knowledge. This goal, however, has consistently placed teaching in a second rate status. Good research and scholarship are more visible and quantifiable than good teaching. Good research brings in the grant money and the rewards. Good research gets published or presented.

Second, because of the first goal, undergraduate teaching is frequently assigned to teaching and graduate assistants. During one's graduate education there is little or no preparation in effective teaching, nor classes in learning theories or teaching strategies. GA's or TA's are "thrown to the wolves." Consequently, the young Ph.D. is faced with classes for which he/she has no repertoire of knowledge for effective teaching beyond the knowledge (content) base.

Third, there is no campus support. (This is documented in research yet to be discussed here.) Teaching is a very personal characteristic on which most are hesitant to be evaluated. This leads to why so few faculty participate in faculty development programs or centers and why senior faculty shy away from offering any advice or resources to new Ph.D's.

Seldin calls for a new professionalism for college teaching and the development of a campus climate that supports and rewards effective teaching. He presents specific ways in which such a campus climate places teaching as high priority without suffering the research. Although he admits that doing this calls for a painstaking administrative undertaking. "Not many institutions have been willing and able to sustain a long-term commitment to analysis and critical discourse about teaching" (p. 4).

The strength of this article is Seldin's inclusion of an extensive list of key characteristics for the formation of faculty development programs. He also lists institutions implementing successful programs for new and junior faculty thus conveying the esteem each has for good teaching. To simply prescribe the way it should be done only creates grandiose assumptions which are rarely carried out. Seldin's approach is to support faculty development by presenting the main approaches for developing strong programs. He then wins over the reader by saying here are the programs which have worked at other universities.

Boice, R. (1991). New faculty as teachers. Journal of Higher Education, 62, 150-173.

Boice follows the pioneering work of Fink (1984) done in the late 1970's and early 80's. His study here focused on two large campuses and utilized the interview format for gathering both qualitative and quantitative results. Interviews were conducted each semester, and all subjects had had minimal teacher training in their graduate school programs. This extensive research depicted the formative stages of new faculty as teachers over one- and two-year periods.

Boice painstakingly interviewed subjects and found a very slow pattern of establishing a comfort zone with their subject matter and students. Boice posited several research questions: Do initial teaching patterns tend to persist? What can be learned from the experiences of new faculty who master teaching quickly and enjoyably? How does success in teaching correspond to expertise in areas including the establishment of collegial supports and of scholarly writing?

In the beginning of their academic careers, new faculty in this study believed that they would feel pressure to write and have little time to teach. Reality, however, showed they spent large amounts of time in preparing lectures. Writing and other things which supposedly could wait were put aside until new faculty had time or energy left over from teaching. Unfortunately, the subjects in this study experienced no collegial support, especially regarding teaching. This inattention to teaching surprised new faculty since all expressed a desire for concrete help, such as using syllabi and tests from courses that preceded theirs.

As the first year of teaching passed, the subjects suffered from a growing disillusionment with teaching. They felt fellow faculty members were gossipy and suffered from burn out. Campus politics, complaints about campus resources, and negativism toward students' behaviors and abilities were topics of conversation with senior faculty.

Boice also identified how new faculty taught in comparison with senior faculty. He found that only over time did new faculty relax their styles to include more student participation. Most, however, continued using the lecture format and concentrated on presenting lots of content organized in terms of concepts and lists.

In a separate focus, Boice identified several inexperienced new faculty who had found a comfort level with their teaching early in their careers. These 12 subjects showed evidence of characteristics such as positive attitudes about students, evidence of seeking advice about teaching (although this had to be self-generated), and evidence of a greater readiness to become involved in campus faculty development programs which were available.

Boice found in his study that new faculty were noncommittal about change and improvements and saw as their primary goals managing time and being effective with students. To counteract these situations, Boice calls for helping new faculty find balance between lecturing and student participation activities in their classes and time management. He suggests safeguarding new faculty from all but private and formative evaluations of their classroom performance for the first year or two. He also calls for involving new faculty in programs which help them find appealing and comfortable classroom instructional strategies, and observe more intensely those individuals who excel quickly as new faculty members.

Boice's main hypothesis, that more needs to be known about how new faculty establish teaching styles, was confirmed. Unfortunately, identifying this calls for a thorough understanding of the research pursued by experts like Boice. Any student in the classroom of a new faculty member can attest that frequently new teachers are timid, nervous, uncertain, and even negative about the institution in front of the class. In addition, some of Boice's ideas for improvement are radical enough that universities may not want to involve themselves with the planning necessary to get such programs running. Certainly all are worth considering by institutions, however, who are committed to improving teaching.

NOTE: Boice's (1992) newest book is a compilation of 10 plus years of researching new and junior faculty. His interest began in this area after observing for years faculty who were clearly unsuccessful at midcareer, and he is regarded as an expert in this field as witnessed to the numerous citings of his work across the literature. A psychologist, Boice captures all the emotions, the uncertainties, and the dilemmas of new and junior faculty. Time did not permit this author to read all of the book. However, his theme throughout is that prescribed faculty development programs do not work. He quotes another researcher by saying faculty development programs are an "academic Catch-22 where those who seek help don't need it, those who do need it don't seek it, and there are no incentives for improving" (p. 8).

Boice, R. (1992). The New Faculty Member. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fink, L.D. (1984). The First Year of College Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boice, R. (1991). New faculty as colleagues. Qualitative Studies in Education, 4, 29-44.

Boice based this longitudinal study on previous studies indicating that new faculty are not particularly accepted by senior faculty, that conflicts arise between their values and those of senior faculty, and that new faculty suffer from a kind of social isolation.

Boice's study proceeded over four years with the study of four successively hired cohorts of new faculty at a comprehensive university with 35,000 students and 1,000 full-time faculty. He specifically looked at feelings of loneliness, lack of intellectual stimulation, and the status of collegiality and in doing so Boice heard complaints about senior faculty. They routinely excluded themselves from departmental decisions and complained about new faculty's greater interest in gaining national visibility as professionals. They were disinterested in hearing accounts of new faculty's research. Finally, senior faculty were discouraged by the poor quality of students and limited campus resources.

Obviously the behaviors of senior faculty affected the perceptions of new faculty, causing new faculty to question their own effectiveness and appropriateness at the particular institution. This study indicated that new faculty have to earn their own way into the good graces of senior faculty. Only when they accepted this idea were they able to adjust to the feelings of social isolation and gain self-confidence. In most cases, subjects did not adjust to those feelings until their fifth semester on campus. By that time they had found a friend (usually someone with whom they socialized off campus) and one potential collaborator (someone with whom they discussed academic matters at least once weekly). By the fourth year, new faculty reported less of a need for collegiality. This was probably beneficial considering they reported no improvement regarding the gossip/politics-laden exchanges with senior faculty.

Although Boice expected to hear about isolation and overwork in his interviews, he did not expect to here the numerous complaints about the slow rate of change from the busyness and isolation from the first semester to the fourth year. Boice believed that the neglect of new faculty bordered on mistreatment given this particular campus' interest in faculty development.

Boice hits directly upon a key problem for new and junior faculty, and one which is documented elsewhere here. Future research needs to look at why senior faculty behave in this manner. Is it institutional dissatisfaction manifesting itself as anger against the new faculty? Is it burnout? Is it related somehow to tenure or collective bargaining? Whatever the reasons, institutions need to attack the situation. As one subject in this study concluded, "We seem willing to let people, even good people, fail here if they don't figure things out on their own" (p. 42).

Whitt, E. (1991). "Hit the ground running": Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. Review of Higher Education, 14, 177-197.

This research was based in the theories of organizational psychologists: Uncertainty must be reduced as one makes an entry into an organization. This calls for defining the expectations of others in the organization and relating oneself to those expectations--almost a "filling in the blank" philosophy (p. 179). Unfortunately, what is expected and what is real can cause conflicts as one tries to deal with the social and functional requirements of the job.

Initially, Whitt believed new faculty members are assumed to bring with them all the skills they need to function in their job. Therefore, new faculty are left alone to figure out what they are supposed to do, relying on previous experiences and self interpretations to make sense of the new setting.

Whitt's study found this is what happens at a large, midwestern research university's school of education. She studied collegiality, attitudes, and expectations of new faculty members, the department chair roles, workload, and new faculty's feelings about their experiences. These themes contributed to Whitt's use of the "hit the ground running" metaphor. New faculty members were expected to "hit the ground running," to establish themselves quickly as teachers and researchers. They were surprised to discover they had to take the initiative in interacting with colleagues. Longstanding, departmental traditions (the "we've always done it this way" syndrome) frustrated new faculty who wanted to effect change. Senior faculty felt the new faculty should not wait to have their needs anticipated; they should be more assertive and self-motivated.

Given these two different perceptions, new faculty expressed confusion, isolation, lack of emotional and financial support, and a terror over the tenure process. Their path to professional success was blocked with an unexpected and bewildering number of obstacles, calling for much time spent in finding answers to questions--even trying to discover the right questions to ask.

The drawback to this study is the small sample size (n=8). However, the qualitative research method allowed for in-depth examination of the problems for this group of new and junior faculty, thus setting the stage for future research. The study clearly identifies that what new faculty expect and what senior faculty assume are two different things. Institutions and administrative leadership are responsible for bringing the two points of view together. According to Whitt, new faculty members need "clearer directions about the track, more consistent information about the events in which they are running, and a much louder cheering section" (p. 195).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rosch, T., & Reich, J. (1996). The enculturation of new faculty in higher education: A comparative investigation of three academic departments. Research in Higher Education, 37, 115-131.

Rosch and Reich based their study in institutional culture and socialization literature which supports that learning the values, knowledge, attitudes, skills, and expectations of a particular culture are acquired by new individuals as they become familiar with an organization. Culture itself, however, is an evolving phenomenon shaped by the interaction of newcomers and old-timers within the institution.

The enculturation model of organizational entry used in this study is defined as the examination of "ways in which different academic disciplinary subcultures select, socialize, and express institutional culture to new faculty" (p. 115). This study looked at new and current faculty members of three separate departments of a doctoral granting I institution. Through questionnaires distributed at different times over the year long study, the researchers identified stages within the actual enculturation process. Within each stage, comparisons were then made between new faculty and current faculty in an attempt to describe the reciprocal nature of both during the socialization of new faculty.

The so-called stages of enculturation in the study were identified as: 1. Prearrival--the time when expectations are formulated about the new setting as one begins a new position; 2. Encounter--what preconceptions are formed early in the new job setting based on information from departments, individuals, administrators, etc.; 3. Adaptation--comparison of the anticipated expectations and experiences and what actual experiences take place; and 4. Commitment--settling into a place within the department while depicting the special features of the departmental culture. This stage occurs when new faculty question their preconceptions about the institution and respond in a number of different ways, i.e., emotionally, verbally or nonverbally, negatively or positively, depending on the individual.

This study is interesting but overwhelming for anyone who does not appreciate the enculturation concept. The reader needs to get beyond the complicated issues because the basic idea of the study is useful and the findings have a broad array of implications for practice. For example, given that new faculty learn or misinterpret performance expectations through minimal word-of-mouth communication, departments should frequently and formally disseminate information about performance standards and expected procedures to all faculty. Since the chair has a crucial role in helping the new faculty member reduce role uncertainty, the chair must be responsible for helping newcomers feel a legitimate member of the work environment. In addition, the chair should also serve as a role model for other faculty who need to be encouraged to establish collegial and intellectual climate with the new faculty.

Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. Journal of Higher Education, 64, 453-471.

Olsen's study presented a major dilemma facing any who are new to a position and of even greater magnitude in academe: What do first year faculty need in making the transition into higher education versus what do they actually receive? Studies show that the early years of a faculty appointment are a period of intense socialization--a time of high stress levels and relatively low satisfaction. What is not known is how junior faculty manage to excel in the early years of their appointments despite this stress.

The premise for this study was that new faculty may be preoccupied with defining and meeting institutional expectations, reducing the uncertainty of their surroundings, establishing collegial ties, and negotiating numerous role demands (p. 456). The question became, therefore, to what extent do the intellectual and personal satisfactions of the academic career remain stable over time for junior faculty and to what extent do external factors reinforce or diminish satisfaction. Is a faculty member's sense of autonomy sufficient enough to maintain high levels of satisfaction with one's work? What other issues might contribute to a sense of dissatisfaction?

The breadth of this study was ambitious, given the length of time covered, the different aspects surveyed, and the number of interesting findings which it supported. Olsen's longitudinal study surveyed over 50 newly hired, tenure-track faculty from a large research university, incorporating interviews and questionnaires the first and third years of academic appointment. Subjects were asked to rate the satisfaction level with 18 different aspects of their work, including areas such as faculty work satisfaction, inner rewards, conflict and balance between work and home life, recognition, support of colleagues, support for teaching, compensation and fringe benefits, and job security.

The findings indicated overall a high level of job satisfaction along with high levels of stress in the first year of the study and a decline of job satisfaction and a minimal increase in work related stress the third year. The work-related stress was attributable to time and balance conflicts, compensation issues, feedback, and job security. There was a fairly high and consistent level of satisfaction with the autonomy and intellectual challenges of the academic world, but a steadily lower level of job satisfaction about compensation and the general nature of the institution's governance. Most significant was that in neither the first or the third year was there satisfaction with the amount of support from colleagues.

This study strongly suggests that first year faculty need to be provided with social, intellectual, and physical support systems. They face heavy teaching loads, lack of responses to requests for equipment or personnel,

and a kind of interpersonal indifference from senior faculty members. Yet they perceive senior faculty as being highly advantaged because of tenure status.

Olsen offers several solutions for addressing this situation. First year faculty need consultation time with their chairs, mentoring programs or new faculty seminars which would help them with time management issues, policies and procedures of the university, and clear definition of their roles within the system. They need a better understanding of the physical resources and an understanding of the support staff within their colleges or departments.

Olsen concludes by suggesting that low faculty job satisfaction and high stress leads to poor productivity and high turnover for the institution. Such costs can ill be afforded as institutions face a diminishing pool of applicants. "There is a pressing need for more extensive and systematic examination of pretenure career development" (p. 468). New faculty are an investment in the future of the institution.

Olsen's study exemplifies the usefulness of longitudinal studies, yet the reasons why more such studies are not done: they require much diligence in keeping track of subjects, and they can be cumbersome when ascertaining the findings. Olsen's subject pool was small and manageable (n=52), and by the third year her follow-up attrition rate was less than 10%. Even with a small pool, however, she uncovered numerous topics through her interviews related to work satisfaction and stress. A larger sample across several institutions would add a considerable body of findings to this research area, possibly validating that the sources and levels of stress within faculty are affecting their performances.

Sorcinelli, M., & Near, J. (1989). Relations between work and life away from work among university faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 60, 59-81.

Sorcinelli and Near call for research in an area which has for the most part gone untapped: The relationship between academic work and personal life. Because previous research generally has focused on the general nature of work-family relationships, the researchers rely on studies outside of higher education in developing a theoretical framework for their research.

These outside studies come from two perspectives. First is the relationship between work and life away from work and the mechanisms one uses in relating the two. This includes the experiences and/or associated feelings of work which color or "spill over" and affect life away from work and vice versa. Second is the view that work satisfaction contributes in some amount to life satisfaction (p. 61).

For their study Sorcinelli and Near looked at junior faculty--a distinct sub-group at a large university--and identified the amount and kind (negative or positive) of spillover there was given the pressures and stress which junior faculty experienced. They surveyed 112 faculty with the sampling stratified by rank and sex. In identifying the extent to which academic work is related to life away from work, three major conclusions were drawn in this study:

1. Work is more central to the lives of faculty than it is in other occupations. Specifically, job characteristics may influence levels of nonwork satisfaction and vice versa and the correlation between job and life satisfaction is greater for faculty members than for the general population
2. Correlation between job and life satisfaction was not significantly higher for male faculty members than for female faculty members.
3. Gender is unrelated to the incidence of spillover between work and aspects of life away from work.

The results showed a high correlation between job and life satisfaction and a high incidence of spillover between work and life away from work. Faculty were expected to research with vigor, consequently work is usually taken home. Faculty lived near to their universities, making it very easy to drop in and drop out to do more work. Faculty tended to form friendships with other faculty rather than a variety of people from other occupations. Sabbaticals frequently turned into time to catch up with previous work or become combined with vacation. Teaching night classes, attending conferences, working at home all tended to interfere with home routines.

These findings challenge the way institutions function because there is very little separation of the work from home environment. The researchers suggest several remedies for this situation with the most

important being the establishment of faculty development centers. These centers should integrate personal and professional growth through programs on topics such as time management, finances, stress, intimacy, social activities, academic environment and family life. In addition, advocacy at the department levels which is often found to be minimal should include formal counseling and mentoring programs.

The findings in this study are directed toward institutions. In doing that, the researchers have ignored those most affected by these results--the new faculty member. Whether or not faculty development opportunities at their universities are provided, all new faculty would do well to read this study. Because of the overlap between home and work environments, new faculty easily slip into allowing their jobs to overwhelm their personal lives. If nothing else, this study could move new faculty a little closer to what is reality once they begin a tenure track position. This would allow them to take steps right from the beginning to minimize the stress created from the overlap of their professional and personal lives.

Gmelch, W., Wilke, P., & Lovrich, N. (1986). Dimensions of stress among university faculty: Factor-analytic results from a national study. Research in Higher Education, 24, 266-286.

The researchers based the need for their study on several givens. First, the "plethora of roles" with which faculty are faced creates a "multifaceted complex of strains on individuals in the academic role" (p. 267). Second, previous research has not been directed to stress-inducing dimensions of the academic workplace. Those which have been identified are administrative bureaucracy, red tape, excessive time pressures, and insufficient resources as reasons for the stress.

For this study, the researchers identified sources of faculty stress falling under each of the three main responsibility areas for faculty: teaching, research, and service activities. They then identified how these stressors are associated with the professional characteristics of discipline, rank, and tenure and with personal characteristics of age, gender, and marital status.

Findings were not surprising. The main sources of stress for faculty were related to: 1. Reward and recognition (and specifically the lack of reward and recognition and unclear expectations); 2. Time constraints (paperwork, meetings, visitor interruptions); 3. Departmental influences (resolving differences, knowing evaluative criteria, influencing decisions); 4. Professional identity (striving to develop a positive, scholarly reputation); and 5. Student interaction (areas related to students' instruction).

The researchers also reported that higher stress levels were associated with lower rank and untenured status. Much of the stress, according to the researchers, was related to the overly vague specification of criteria for tenure and promotion. For example, how many journal articles, books or grants are expected? How heavily do teaching and service weigh in relationship to research accomplishments?

This study was conducted at a time when stress was becoming somewhat of an "in topic." Much research was being done primarily in response to earlier studies identifying major life stressors and reporting the high incidence of Americans suffering from high blood pressure and heart disease. This study raised serious questions which deans and central administrators should have been addressing with new faculty. Unfortunately, more current research indicates that not much has changed at universities since the study was published in attempting to diminish the high incidence of stress among faculty. The experiences and expertise of administrative leaders should be devoted to relieving the high stress potential for new faculty by providing them support as they establish their respective professional identities.

Sorcinelli., M. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. Sorcinelli and A. Austin (Eds.), Developing New and Junior Faculty (pp. 27-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sorcinelli based her research on a paradox which she had identified as occurring in many studies on new and junior faculty: Most new faculty had described their academic life as "providing personal autonomy, a sense of accomplishment, the capacity to have an impact on others, and the opportunity for personal and intellectual growth" (p.27). However, the stress and sources of tension in that first year were not minimized by the experience. Of most serious consequence is that as the number of new faculty reporting a stressful work life increased, the level of job satisfaction steadily decreased.

In this article, Sorcinelli pooled together previous studies, including some four- and five-year, long-range studies, in an effort to identify the major stresses reported by untenured faculty. These included the stressors of not enough time, little if any feedback or recognition, uncertain or unreal expectations, lack of respect and rapport, and balancing the needs and duties of personal life with the requirements for professional success.

Of significant interest in this article were the coping strategies which Sorcinelli suggested new faculty members use to better deal with academic stress. She concluded that the individual faculty member should start using these while at the developing and learning level, strongly supporting that overcoming the stressors of the job is primarily the responsibility of the new faculty member.

Although the strategies (i.e., prioritize, set realistic goals, seek social support on an off the campus) can be most useful, Sorcinelli's view is clearly controversial. Many other studies, including several in this bibliography, support the idea that faculty members cannot and should not be expected to do it all alone. They need and deserve help from the institution which hires them.

NOTE: This is one of eight articles in the Sorcinelli & Austin book. Two others (Finkelstein & LaCelle-Peterson, 1992; Wheeler, 1992) are presented in this bibliography. However, all eight articles are relevant and useful to anyone pursuing the topic of new and junior faculty.

Sands, R., Parson, L., & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. Journal of Higher Education, 62, 174-193.

Levinson, et al. (1978) wrote The Seasons of A Man's Life which these researchers credit with the development of current thinking about the mentor-protégé relationship. Levinson, et al. identified the mentor as a developmentally significant, transitional figure for men in the early years of adulthood, ages 17-33.

Following on Levinson's work and previous research tracing mentoring in corporations and business, these researchers noted no line of research which specifically traces mentoring in academic settings (p. 177). Their study gathered quantitative and descriptive information on the nature and extent of mentoring and career support among faculty at a public, midwest university. The starting point was for subjects to respond to queries on their own mentoring history at various points in their careers.

The results included the identification of individual mentors which the 24 subjects had had and what form the mentoring took, i.e., intellectual guidance, advice on publication, advice about people, involvement on professional networking, etc. Of most interest to the topic of this bibliography was that rarely did subjects receive help with teaching. Also, most of the mentoring took place during graduate school. Having a mentor once one has become faculty does not appear to be the norm according to this study.

This research and the decline in mentoring suggested two things: First, a Ph.D. is identified as a terminal degree for scholarship. With it is the presumption that the recipient is therefore "capable of autonomous practice as a university professor" (p. 188). No support is needed.

Second, "help with teaching" was one of the functions with which the subjects had minimal mentoring. Unfortunately, this too seems an area which is assumed to be learned in graduate school. Suggesting that a new Ph.D. might need (or want) help with teaching is an unapproachable topic.

The idea of mentoring is not new. But this study shows that mentoring between faculty members is not prevalent. Lack of it contributes to the stress, negativism and loneliness as identified in other articles in this bibliography. Faculty mentoring programs could easily be designed by those willing to serve as mentors, with "the acknowledgment of the kind of help they are willing to provide and the recognition that the diverse character of mentoring calls for sensitive and differential application of the concept" (p. 191).

Levinson, D., et al. (1978). The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Ballantine.

Blackburn, R., Chapman, D., & Cameron, S. (1981). "Cloning" in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. Research in Higher Education, 15, 315-327.

The researchers investigated mentoring from a different perspective than the Sands, Parson, and Duane (1991) study. The uniqueness of the study lies in its method of gathering data. Current faculty (132 from eight different universities) who had had mentors earlier in their academic careers were asked to present their views on the nature and closeness of the mentor-protégé relationship. They were asked to identify their mentors who in turn were also interviewed regarding the same mentoring issues. Mentors were not told which protégés nominated them for participation in this study.

Certain characteristics of those mentors who were nominated became obvious during data collection. The mentors nominated were overwhelmingly men (90%). Eighty-one percent were on the faculties of Carnegie Research II universities. They also had graduated from a major research university, then became employed in the same type of university. Protégés also were predominately with Research II universities.

None of the mentors regarded mentoring as a burden. In fact, 91% of the mentors saw the experience as very or moderately satisfying. Regarding how the mentor-protégé relationship begins, 43% of the mentors indicated they served as the initiators. Thirty percent said the initiation was about equally divided between themselves and their protégés.

Surprisingly, mentors listed only two kinds of responses regarding the types of satisfactions and pleasures they received from mentoring: the production of new knowledge and the opportunity to work with students. However, all recognized that the professional stature and accomplishments of the mentor were important to the academic productivity and advancement of their protégés. Therefore, the mentoring relationship offers positive rewards to both the mentor and the protégé. The researchers believed that institutions should identify policies and behaviors which foster the beginning of productive mentorship relationships.

Despite the date of this study, it brings to light a dimension of the mentoring relationship which is not frequently discussed. The results imply that in a mentor-protégé relationship the protégé is likely to follow the same kind of career path as his/her mentor. Consequently, if the mentor is at one kind of university (particularly a Research I university) the more likely the protégé is to secure a spot through professional networking in the same kind of institution. If, however, the protégé finds employment outside a high-status university, the chances for a continued productive relationship with the mentor is reduced.

One wonders if the same results would be obtained if a similar study were run today especially in light of the findings in other studies in this bibliography. The Blackburn, Chapman, and Cameron study stops short in identifying the mentor-protégé relationships in lesser status universities. Nor does it identify the effect on the protégé's chances of moving into a research or doctoral granting institution if his/her mentor remains at the lesser status university. Even the title of the article to include the word "cloning" suggests a kind of tongue-in-cheek attitude toward the mentoring topic. Future research is needed to identify the impact of the mentoring relationship within the institutional hierarchies. The impact may have far greater consequences today than the researchers imagined in 1981.

Chism, N., Cano, J., & Pruitt, A. (1989). Teaching in a diverse environment: Knowledge and skills needed by TA's. In J. Nyquist, R. Abbott & D. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990's (pp. 23-36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

In light of research indicating new and junior faculty have received no training as TA's (teaching assistants) or GA's (graduate assistants), the researchers here present training which they believe is imperative if TA's are to be responsive to the diverse student body of today's higher education institutions. No longer is the well respected lecturing format seen as the most effective instructional strategy given the composition of today's classrooms. Students today are from numerous ethnic and social backgrounds. Many are returning to school after a long absence; many are just beginning after years in the work force. Yet the authors note that very few changes have occurred in the ways universities approach teaching and learning and thus respond to the different populations.

The researchers present practical ways in which new and junior faculty can better serve the diverse student population in the teaching setting. Getting instructors to modify or change, however, requires a change in one's philosophical approach to teaching. No longer should instructors think of teaching as content or subject-matter centered, but rather student centered. To be effective in the college classroom with diverse student populations, instructors need to care about how they organize and present content and about how effective their strategies are with students. They should recognize the individuality of students and the discrimination that is so prevalent in society and thus manifests itself into today's classrooms. The development of student-centered teaching, discussions, role playing. laboratory or project work, should all be considered.

The researchers conclude with a strong statement calling for those TA's who are preparing to teach to carefully examine their own attitudes and ask themselves whether they are committed to ensuring the success of their students. The authors caution that "teaching will not necessarily succeed just because it is based on subject matter" (p. 35).

This article's focus, one of several in the Nyquist, Abbott, and Wulff book, is prescriptive--what TA's need for becoming sensitive to diversity in the classroom. Detailed discussion of the characteristics of nontraditional students (including ethnic minorities, adults, disabled students, women, and gay-lesbian populations) and related problem areas, such as financial aid, family situations, cultural biases, previous educational backgrounds, etc. are certainly useful. However, TA's probably need most a guiding hand of continuous supervision to aid them in assessment and follow-up in the development of their teaching styles and to create effective, student-centered classrooms. Unfortunately, this guiding hand is not easily or cheaply implemented in institutions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Weimer, M., Svinicki, M., & Bauer, G. (1989). Designing programs to prepare TA's to teach. In J. Nyquist & R. Abbot, & D. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990's (pp. 57-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This study along with the previously discussed Chism, Cano, & Pruitt (1989) article are both part of a collection of articles focusing on the topic of TA training. The previous article gave specifics on recognizing the diversity of classroom populations in order to create a student-centered classroom. This article presents a practical approach toward creating a TA training program.

The researchers for this study interviewed persons closely associated with TA training programs in 14 large, public universities. A list of the programs and universities and the persons interviewed was conveniently listed at the end of the article making it easy and convenient to contact any of them for future reference.

Training according to the researchers should be offered through: 1. a faculty development unit of the university; 2. the department to which a TA is assigned; 3. specialized training for a single course with multiple sections (i.e., English composition); 4. the graduate school or college. Typically, the initial training (like an orientation) is provided by the faculty development unit followed by individual departmental training.

Cooperation, coordination and integration were the essential requirements when several different activities were offered or required across university departments.. Content, length of time, attendance policy, follow-up activities, and evaluation were identified in the study as essential considerations for developing training programs.

For anyone planning a TA training program, this article offers a good starting point toward that end. The fact that such involved programs are being done and can be done at large institutions should offer hope to any institution wanting to begin this kind of training. Obviously, no one program design is appropriate to all universities. Programs need to be written to best meet the needs of the university, taking into consideration the authors' points. Once a training program is in place, it needs to be consistently monitored, evaluated, and altered to meet the changing needs of the university departments, colleges, and of students over time.

Freudenthal, N., & DiGiorgio, A. (1989). New faculty mentoring: The institution as mentor. Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, 7, 67-71.

The researchers found that almost without exception at their college, Trenton State College in New Jersey, a highly selective multi-purpose institution, faculty agreed that the first year of teaching was everything from demanding to harrowing. Perhaps because of its strong commitment to academic excellence, much was expected of new faculty their first year--"a period when time is short, demands are many, and stress can be high" (p. 67).

Unfortunately, no sources of assistance were identified at Trenton and only an occasional older faculty member was willing to work with a new faculty member in any kind of a mentoring capacity. Older faculty often did not offer help with any kind of regularity, in part because of the historically autonomous nature of the job. Usually it was assumed that help was not needed.

Therefore, key people in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs at Trenton began an institutional mentoring program. This program was an attempt to help all faculty embrace the idea that mentoring is not just of personal importance. "Since one cannot mandate, force or otherwise require a successful one-to-one mentoring relationship, the college should make an institutional commitment to fostering the careers of its new faculty" (p. 68).

Specifics of this program include the scheduling of regular meetings, the focusing on topics from within the research literature, providing introductions of new faculty to older faculty, and developing a "scholarly action plan." This plan aids new faculty in either completing their dissertations or beginning their record of scholarly achievement by creating a brief document to include work when completed, a timetable for carrying out work, a list of needed resources, etc.

This program had been evaluated through surveys which identified it has worked well at Trenton based on the numerous comments and the high degree of professional activity among the faculty participants. Given the competitiveness of this institutional environment, it serves as a powerful aid in helping new faculty make the transition into the institution. Follow-up is warranted to identify if the program has had the impetus to successfully continue.

This article is a practical guide for creating a comprehensive, formal mentoring program. This program is not meant to take the place of the personal nature of a more traditional mentoring relationship, however. Rather it suggests an organized and detailed program which addresses the professional activities and obligations of new faculty on an on-going basis.

Wheeler, D. (1992). The role of the chairperson in support of junior faculty. In M. Sorcinelli and A. Austin (Eds.), Developing New and Junior Faculty (pp. 87-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wheeler's point of view is that department chairpersons can and should facilitate the junior faculty members. Becoming acclimated to an institution is not easy and department chairs can enhance the likelihood of success. Along with the literature review, his article is based on numerous personal consultations with chairs about the issues which face junior faculty and the strategies needed for success. Wheeler's work is also grounded in Creswell, et al (1990), The Academic Chairperson's Handbook.

Wheeler first presents what junior faculty need. These needs are divided into the areas of understanding institutional roles and expectations, how to get things done on campus, developing positive working relationships, obtaining necessary feedback for improvement, and time management.

Wheeler then outlines very specific roles which a chairperson should adapt in order to facilitate progress in the early years of colleagues' careers. One role sees the chair as a critical connection or link between junior faculty resources and resource people at the university. This calls for disseminating and communicating information through orientation sessions, held both informally and formally. Addressing issues such as academic performance standards, policies and practices, available research funds, grants, effective teaching strategies, etc. will reduce much uncertainty for new faculty members. Other roles include mentoring, developing verbal and written correspondence to keep expectations clarified, and evaluating new faculty progress.

This study calls to task the department chairs since they are most often the first link the new faculty member has with the university. Ultimately, the department chair is involved with the initial hiring of the new faculty member. Consequently it makes common sense that they accept some responsibility for new faculty. There is nothing ethical in saying to someone "we feel you are qualified for this job" only to follow a "sink or swim" philosophy once that person is at the institution.

For future research, this study suggests investigation into why chairpersons are often reticent to help new and junior faculty. Also useful would be the identification of specific roles of the chair which can serve as support mechanisms to better ensure that the new faculty member has a realistic and fair chance at succeeding.

Creswell, J., et al. (1990). The Academic Chairperson's Handbook. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Matier, M. (1990). Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses. Research in Higher Education, 31, 39-60.

Matier investigated the dimensions which influenced the final outcome for faculty members who were faced with decisions to leave. His study included 239 tenure tracked faculty at two universities. Excluded were any faculty who had been denied tenure during the year of the study. Data was initially gathered by questionnaires with follow-up interviews.

Matier's study presumed that several stages are part of the decision making process when one is faced with whether to stay or to leave an employment situation: 1. easy of making a change; 2. perceived desire to move; 3. the balance between inducements and benefits for staying; and 4. the final decision.

Ease in making a change lies heavily upon personal demographic information. In determining one's perceived desire to move, Matier focused on the internal and external environmental factors. Classified under internal factors are intangible benefits (personal and institutional reputation, autonomy, influence, sense of being) and tangible benefits (wages, facilitates, work rules, benefits). External factors are those not directly related to work (quality of life, family, friendships).

Matier hypothesized that only those faculty who perceived low internal and low external environments would have the desire to leave and consequently terminate their present positions. All other combinations,. i.e., low internal and higher external benefits, high internal and low external benefits, and high internal and external benefits, would more likely cause on to remain in his/her present position.

Although the subjects in this study were concerned with their work environment, overall it was the association of intangible benefits with the work environment which were most important to them. Nonwork related benefits had little impact and influence on the decision to move. For example, the reputation of the institution and one's sense of well being and sense of belonging to the institution were more important in the decision-making process than were family and friends. "Individuals leave jobs mostly because of internal push rather than external pull" (p. 57).

This study is important to this bibliography because what was found is easily related to new and junior faculty. By directly asking subjects a broad spectrum of possible considerations, a comprehensive picture of the factors affecting their employment decisions was obtained. Institutions desiring to attract and maintain quality faculty would do well to make a commitment to support faculty, to support good teaching and acknowledge it by including faculty more in decision making and by offering services to faculty for both personal and professional development.

Brinko, K. (1990). Instructional consultation with feedback in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 61, 65-83.

For the improvement of teaching, some university faculty development programs will incorporate instructional consultants. These consultants visit the classroom of an instructor then feed back to the instructor the information that he/she gathered from the visit.

Brinko believed that many consultants have no training in such an endeavor. To complicate the matter further, there is little literature upon which to draw resources. This situation led Brinko to question 10 instructional consultants at eight research and doctoral granting universities. Previously she had done research on the effectiveness of using student ratings for improving instruction. Unfortunately, this feedback produced only minimal improvement in teaching (p. 66).

The 10 subjects/consultants in this study submitted video tapes of their follow-up discussions with teachers and then responded to a questionnaire identifying consultant demographic characteristics, educational attainments, and consultation practice. All consultants were employed full-time as instructional improvement specialists in an office or center for faculty development.

Brinko was looking at the most prevalent patterns of verbal interaction between consultant and teachers, other patterns which may have surfaced, and how the style of experienced consultants differed from novice consultants. To aid in the understanding of her study, Brinko included in an appendix the verbal behaviors which were coded into a computer program for use in data analysis.

As one might imagine, there was great variability among the 10 consultants in their verbal behaviors. However, the consultants did spend almost half of their sessions in silence, listening to their clients or reviewing data. And in turn, the clients also spent about half the time listening and half speaking. None of these results were particularly earth shattering. Brinko acknowledged that further data needs to be explored such as other subtle yet important differences which may exist in nonverbal behaviors, complexity of problems and solutions, the way questions are phrased, etc. (p. 77).

What is most disheartening with the results is the consultants reported that they had had no formal training in consulting--suggesting an almost "seat of the pants" approach and probably why no significant differences emerged between those consultants with one year of experience and those with many years.

Consulting work often is associated with later-in-career activities and can be very lucrative for those with earned expertise in a field. Using

qualified professionals in helping instructors improve their classroom effectiveness is clearly a sound idea. With little teaching experience, however, the credibility of instructional consultants is questionable. For teachers who need even minimal help in improving classroom techniques, having an inexperienced consultant try to effect change could cause animosity or low morale. At the same time, hiring consultants who are not productive or useful is costly for the institution. Follow-up research in this area would prove beneficial in assessing further the direction institutions might follow in hiring instructional consultants.

Blackburn, R., et al. (1991). Faculty at work: Focus on teaching, Research in Higher Education, 32, 363-383.

Blackburn, R., et al. (1991). Faculty at work: Focus on research, scholarship, and service. Research in Higher Education, 32, 385-413.

In these back to back journal articles, Blackburn, et al. developed an instrument titled "Faculty at work". The "Faculty at work" instrument was based in cognitive motivation theory which says how people understand the environment, behave, and assess personal priorities, leads them to engage more in some activities and less in others (Bandura, 1977). For many faculty or department heads such a theoretical underpinning could easily serve as a deterrent against reading them. But the scope of the survey is reason enough to pursue the findings.

The "Faculty at work" survey was administered over three months to 4400 faculty members. The purpose was to gather data on their perceptions of their work environment, their own competency and efficacy as faculty members, their assumptions about teaching, and their own teaching, research, and service behaviors.

This study focused on demographic characteristics, career-achieved experiences, self-evaluations and perceptions of the environment. Faculty were asked to identify gender, graduate school experiences, age, rank, to rate themselves in self-competence, self efficacy, personal interest in teaching, research, scholarship, service and the amount of time spent on each, also colleagues' commitments to these areas, to name just a few. Once the data were collected, selected personal and environmental motivation variables for faculty were regressed against faculty allocation of work effort given to teaching, research, scholarship, and service.

For teaching, results indicated that preference for time given to teaching and perceived institutional preference were strong predictors of success indicating that there should be a kind of fit between the two. If faculty believe they have the ability to achieve their goals and that the institution values those same goals, faculty will then believe teaching is an important mission of the institution. This perception in turn affects the efficacy of the teacher.

Although neither rank nor career age predicted the percent of time given to teaching, both beginning professors and full professors near the end of their careers showed a higher interest in teaching than did other faculty. Those professors receiving training in research institutions showed relatively the same effort into teaching as those who received training in all other institutions. This contradicts supposition that graduates from Research I universities do not like teaching. (The researchers added that research institutions which now want to increase commitment to undergraduate teaching have their work cut out for them.)

Most surprising of the numerous conclusions of the two studies was that the younger faculty were publishing more which is an outcome far different from prior surveys according to the researchers. In addition, the graduates of non-Research I universities were the higher publishers, contradicting previous data.

Both studies conclude that the administrative leadership of the institution controls the environments whether that push be toward teaching or toward research. New faculty must be clear which way a university gravitated before accepting positions.

These two studies were among the most interesting read during the compilation of the bibliography. But their scope is not easy to grasp confirming what other studies here have shown--qualitative research can become unwieldy as conclusions are drawn and practical applications are attempted. Going beyond the specifics, however, the results and consequent conclusions make common sense given any institutions desire to improve productivity. If it is important for universities to improve teaching or increase research outcomes, a commitment by the institution must be made through the offering of opportunities for faculty to participate in activities which lend to accomplishing these goals.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral science. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Boice, R. (1995). Developing writing, then teaching amongst new faculty. Research in Higher Education, 36, 415-456.

Boice's most recently published article is a detailed explanation of his program designed to increase productivity of new and junior faculty within their first two years at an institution. He has formulated and tested a paradigm that enables faculty to write and teach without overexertion and misery and without sacrificing social life, health, and leisure time. All too often, when new faculty concentrate only on writing/research or on teaching, they do not succeed at either. Boice suggests that his previous research has shown that improvement in teaching and writing does not occur in a vacuum, but rather both depend on similar kinds of collegial support plus self discipline with each one augmenting the other (p. 416).

For the first year for new faculty this paradigm is set in stages, providing formalized strategies and assessments in writing. These stages aid the faculty in seeking and developing patience and motivation, imagination, practice and fluency, self-discipline, a sense of audience, and a sense of who one is professionally in his/her writing. Commitments of participants to attend weekly group meetings and form partnerships with at least one other group member to aid in support and encouragement are required. Specially designated times for writing, even brief times, are faithfully committed on a daily basis.

The major outcome for this part of the program is the realization by faculty members that they can work and write without burning out within the first year. Of most importance, also, is their recognition that what contributed the most to their success was the constancy: "Until you work at it (writing) every day, you just don't get to be better at it" (p. 429).

The same paradigm with the same stages and the same strategies and assessments are used in the second year as faculty transfer what they use in their writing to use in their teaching. As Boice concludes "constancy and comfort" mean "efficiency and success." "The basics for both writing and teaching are practiced in interactive ways that prove to nurture and inform each other" (p. 453).

Boice's paradigm is extremely extensive and unusual. He combines the research of the top names from the "writing as process" literature with his own years of studying new faculty members and draws a parallel between writers and teachers. To be successful in both, the needed habits, intellectual skills, and attitudes are basic and teachable. Put more simply, learning the basis for and benefits of consistent practice will help one move to a comfort level between increased workload and demands and much needed time away from work. This intriguing program holds much hope for improving the teaching and writing of faculty. However, it is a complicated program, calling for a successful writer and teacher and an expert in Boice's paradigm in order to be run successfully by universities.

Weimer, M. (1990). Improving College Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Effecting change is not easy. Effecting change in one's teaching style, use of instructional strategies, sharing of ideas, may seem next to impossible. Weimer bases the need for her book on issues recognized by most who are close to universities. First, graduate assistants in pursuing terminal degrees for full-time employment as faculty rarely get training to prepare them for the rigors of classroom teaching. Second, faculty tend to rely year after year on the same teaching methods, choices of textbooks, etc. Old habits are hard to break even when one recognizes the habits are less than effective. Third, instructional or faculty development is not widely offered to faculty.

What is particularly frightening about these issues is that they are beginning to come into direct conflict with issues of accountability from parents who pay the rising tuition bills each year and from students who want and deserve the wealth of knowledge which has become known as the information explosion. In addition, the student body has changed to include diversity in the classroom, such as nontraditional (adult) students, and in particular those who want a college education, but come underprepared for academic work. Such dilemmas can be no less than psychologically draining for instructors. Weimer, therefore, taking into consideration the realistic picture of college teaching, proposes a number of ways for effecting change.

With a target audience of teachers as well as instructional developers, department heads, deans, chairs, even academic vice presidents, Weimer illuminates how each has a role in improving college teaching. Her book is divided into three main categories: First is removing barriers to teaching improvement which includes a 5-step approach usable in an institutional improvement process. This approach is not one-time, but rather an on-going, systematic process for evaluating what new and senior faculty do in the classroom in terms of how they teach, what they teach, and to whom they teach.

The second category includes the key elements of successful instructional development. By developing diagnostic and descriptive feedback from students and colleagues, teachers can begin to identify how evaluation is used for improving instruction, clarifying, elaborating, and correcting their understanding of how they teach.

The third category is classified as institutional options for improving teaching. Weimer includes discussion of numerous teaching improvement approaches and formalized programs for effecting change. These programs are used across the country at various universities. Included also is a check list of 14 items for developing one's instructional awareness as a classroom teacher.

Weimer's closing advice consists of a list of 9 conclusions which are summed up best when she calls for institutions to create climates which are conductive to the ongoing quest for instructional quality--a kind of institutional expectation which should be set and adhered to that all newly hired faculty know and understand their roles in the classroom. By doing this, faculty members are empowered from the beginning to approach and strive for quality instruction "with the institution solidly behind their efforts" (p. 203.)

Weimer 's book is an ambitious attempt to slow down the instructional ineffectiveness which looms on the university horizon. Focusing on teacher efficacy, she does an excellent job in putting together a practical "how-to" guide for doing just that. For example, she discusses how the wording of evaluations can offer more concrete ways to improve one's teaching. She even suggests that each teacher write his/her own evaluation instrument so that it can better meet the needs of all instructors.

Numerous publications are available on the topic of improving teaching. What separates this book from many others is its underlying premise. Early on, Weimer advocates for all instructors to evaluate and continue reevaluating their teaching methods, strategies, and classroom effectiveness regardless of years of experience. Frequently, the practice of collecting student evaluations (summative evaluations) is little more than an exercise in futility, offering little help to instructors for effecting change. In addition, many instructors ignore the evaluations because of lack of help from department chairs or mentors as shown in the studies in this bibliography. Weimer calls for in-depth implementation of feedback based on on-going assessment (formative evaluations).

REFERENCES

Blackburn, R., et al. (1991a). Faculty at work: Focus on teaching, Research in Higher Education, 32, 363-383.

Blackburn, R., et al. (1991b). Faculty at work: Focus on research, scholarship, and service. Research in Higher Education, 32, 385-413.

Blackburn, R., Chapman, D., & Cameron, S. (1981). "Cloning" in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. Research in Higher Education, 15, 315-327.

Boice, R. (1991a). New faculty as teachers. Journal of Higher Education, 62, 150-173.

Boice, R. (1991b). New faculty as colleagues. Qualitative Studies in Education, 4, 29-44.

Boice, R. (1995). Developing writing, then teaching amongst new faculty. Research in Higher Education, 36, 415-456.

Brinko, K. (1990). Instructional consultation with feedback in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 61, 65-83.

Chism, N., Cano, J., & Pruitt, A. (1989). Teaching in a diverse environment: Knowledge and skills needed by TA's. In J. Nyquist, R. Abbott & D. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990's (pp. 23-36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Finkelstein, M., & LaCelle-Peterson, M. (1992). New and junior faculty: A review of the literature. In M. Sorcinelli and A. Austin (Eds.), Developing New and Junior Faculty (pp. 5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Freudenthal, N., & DiGiorgio, A. (1989). New faculty mentoring: The institution as mentor. Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, 7, 67-71.

Gmelch, W., Wilke, P., & Lovrich, N. (1986). Dimensions of stress among university faculty: Factor-analytic results from a national study. Research in Higher Education, 24, 266-286.

Matier, M. (1990). Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses. Research in Higher Education, 31, 39-60.

Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. Journal of Higher Education, 64, 453-471.

Rosch, T., & Reich, J. (1996). The enculturation of new faculty in higher education: A comparative investigation of three academic departments. Research in Higher Education, 37, 115-131.

Sands, R., Parson, L., & Duane, J. (1991). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. Journal of Higher Education, 62, 174-193.

Seldin, P. (1990). Academic environments and teaching effectiveness. In P. Seldin (Ed.), How Administrators Can Improve Teaching (pp. 3-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sorcinelli., M. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. Sorcinelli and A. Austin (Eds.), Developing New and Junior Faculty (pp. 27-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sorcinelli, M., & Near, J. (1989). Relations between work and life away from work among university faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 60, 59-81.

The Importance of Teaching. A memorandum to the new college teacher. (1968). Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Teaching, C. Easton Rothwell, Chair.

Weimer, M. (1990). Improving College Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weimer, M., Svinicki, M., & Bauer, G. (1989). Designing programs to prepare TA's to teach. In J. Nyquist & R. Abbot, & D. Wulff (Eds.), Teaching Assistant Training in the 1990's (pp. 57-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wheeler, D. (1992). The role of the chairperson in support of junior faculty. In M. Sorcinelli and A. Austin (Eds.), Developing New and Junior Faculty (pp. 87-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Whitt, E. (1991). "Hit the ground running": Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. Review of Higher Education, 14, 177-197.